

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,989	JAKOBSSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tamara Teslovich	2437		

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) Tamara Teslovich. (3) _____.

(2) David Shifren. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: March 25, 2010

Time: 2:00pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 26, 30

Prior art documents discussed:

Okabe (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0094088)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Teslovich described for Mr. Shifren a novel attribute of Applicant's invention which she believed to be missing from Applicant's claims. She informed him that she had discussed the matter with her superiors and that were Applicant to more particularly claim the fact that his nodes performed distinct functions and that the nodes collectively perform the cryptographic functionality, his claims would be allowable. She also informed him that he would need to amend claim 30 to specify that his machine readable storage medium is non-transitory in order to comply with 35 USC 101. In response, Mr. Shifren provided the Examiner with an amended copy of his claims including all the necessary changes.